

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1, 3, and 5-10<sup>1</sup> have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kocher et al. (US 6,327,661; hereinafter “Kocher”).

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Independent claim 3 recites “A digital integrated circuit comprising: ... means for time-varying a supply voltage of said asynchronous circuit to time-shift the execution point of operations within said asynchronous circuit ...”

Kocher discloses a noise production system 100 having a noise production module 105 configured to sink power, produce electromagnetic radiation, or otherwise introduce noise into attackers’ measurements. See Kocher, column 5, lines 22-29.

While Kocher discloses that noise production system 100 sink’s power, Kocher does not disclose varying a *supply voltage* to time-shift the execution point of operations, as required by independent claim 3.

Further, Kocher does not disclose time-varying a supply voltage of an *asynchronous circuit* using a random number generator, as also required by independent 3.

In rejecting this asynchronous circuit feature, the Examiner refers to the UART (universal asynchronous receiver/transmitter) disclosed in Kocher at column 9, line 4. This portion of Kocher is directed to the embodiment involving clock skipping, not the embodiment involving random noise generation. There is no disclosure or even suggestion in Kocher of time-varying a supply voltage of this UART using a random number generator.

Independent claim 3 is therefore patentable over Kocher for at least these reasons.

---

<sup>1</sup> Claim 5 was not included in the statement of the rejection, but it is clear from reading the Office Action as a whole that this claim was meant to be included.

Since independent claim 1 includes limitations similar to the limitation discussed above with respect to independent claim 3, it is patentable over Kocher for at least the same reasons.

Claims 5-10 depend from the independent claims, and are therefore patentable over Kocher for at least the same reasons.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the prior art rejection are respectfully requested.

Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

In the event a fee is required or if any additional fee during the prosecution of this application is not paid, the Patent Office is authorized to charge the underpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-2215.

Dated: January 25, 2011

Respectfully submitted,

By /Laura C. Brutman/

Laura C. Brutman

Registration No.: 38,395

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP

1633 Broadway

New York, New York 10019-6708

(212) 277-6500

Attorney for Applicant